

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed June 6, 2007. Claims 1-38 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action, Claims 1-10, 14-29 and 33 were rejected, and Claims 11-13 and 30-32 were objected. Thus, Claims 1-38 remain pending in the Application. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

In the Office Action, the following actions were taken or matters were raised:

SECTION 102 REJECTIONS

Claims 1-9, 14-17, 19-28, 33-36 and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0159074 issued to Oar et al. (hereinafter "Oar"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Under 35 U.S.C. § 102, a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051 (Fed. Cir. 1987); M.P.E.P. § 2131. In addition, "[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claims" and "[t]he elements must be arranged as required by the claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 U.S.P.Q.2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989); *In re Bond*, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990); M.P.E.P. § 2131.

Of the rejected claims, Claims 1, 14, 20, and 33 are independent. Claim 1 recites "transmitting, from a wireless local area network (LAN) device of a host device to an access point of a wireless network, a request to disassociate from said access point, said request to disassociate further comprising a request to monitor for wake events for said host device," and "switching off a transceiver of said wireless LAN device after transmission of said disassociate request" (emphasis added). In the Office Action, the Examiner appears to suggest that the sleep or suspend mode of Oar corresponds to the "request to disassociate from said access point" recited in Claim 1. (Office Action dated June 6, 2007, page 2). Applicants respectfully disagree. For example, Oar appears to disclose a system which responds to an event which awakens a computer system from a sleep or suspend mode. (Oar, Abstract and paragraph 0017). Oar appears to disclose that, in sleep mode, the operating system is suspended and

woken up in response to various events, such as the receipt of a fax, email, or telephone call. (*Oar*, paragraph 0017). The *Oar* device appears to only disclose the events and operations associated with waking up the operating system and computer system of *Oar*, but does not disclose or even suggest the operations or events corresponding to placing the computer system of *Oar* into a sleep or suspend state. In fact, nowhere in *Oar* does there appear to be any disclosure or even suggestion of a “request to disassociate from said access point” or the “switching off [of] a transceiver of said wireless LAN device after transmission of said disassociate request” as recited in Claim 1 (emphasis added). Therefore, *Oar* does not disclose or even suggest all the limitations of Claim 1. Thus, for at least this reason, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 1 be withdrawn.

Claim 14 recites “receiving, from a wireless local area network (LAN) device of a host device, a request to disassociate from an access point, said request to disassociate further comprising a request to monitor for at least one wake event for said host device,” and “transmitting, in response to receiving a request for a wake event status, a wake event status indicating whether at least one wake event for said host device occurred” (emphasis added). For at least the reason discussed above in connection with independent Claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 14 is also patentable over *Oar*.

Claim 20 recites “application logic operable to transmit, from a wireless local area network (LAN) device of a host device to an access point of a wireless network, a request to disassociate from said access point, said request to disassociate further comprising a request to monitor for wake events for said host device,” and “switch off a transceiver of said wireless LAN device after transmission of said disassociate request” (emphasis added). For at least the reason discussed above in connection with independent Claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 20 is also patentable over *Oar*.

Claim 33 recites “application logic operable to: receive, from a wireless local area network (LAN) device of a host device, a request to disassociate from an access point, said request to disassociate further comprising a request to monitor for at least one wake event for said host device,” and “transmit, in response to receipt of a request for a wake event status, a wake event status indicating whether at least one wake event for said host device occurred”

(emphasis added). For at least the reason discussed above in connection with independent Claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 33 is also patentable over *Oar*.

Claims 2-9, 15-17, 19, 21-28, 34-36, and 38 depend from respective independent Claims 1, 14, 20, and 33. Claims 2-9, 15-17, 19, 21-28, 34-36, and 38 are also not anticipated by *Oar* at least because they incorporate the limitations of respective independent Claims 1, 14, 20, and 33 and also add additional elements that further distinguish *Oar*. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 2-9, 15-17, 19, 21-28, 34-36, and 38 be withdrawn.

SECTION 103 REJECTIONS

Claims 10, 18, 29, and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Oar* in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0185172 issued to Rue (hereinafter "Rue"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 10, 18, 29, and 37 depend from respective independent Claims 1, 14, 20, and 33. As shown above, Claims 1, 14, 20, and 33 are patentable over *Oar*. In the Office Action, the Examiner does not rely on *Rue* to cure, nor does *Rue* appear to cure, the deficiencies of *Oar*. Therefore, Claims 10, 18, 29, and 37 are also patentable over the cited references at least because they incorporate the limitations of Claims 1, 14, 20, and 33 and also add additional elements that further distinguish the references. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 10, 18, 29, and 37 be withdrawn.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

The Examiner objected to Claims 11-13 and 30-32 as being dependent on a rejected base claim. Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that Claims 11-13 and 30-32 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claims 11-13 and 30-32 depend from independent Claims 1 and 20. For at least the reasons discussed above, Claims 1 and 20 are allowable. Therefore, Claims 11-13 and 30-32 that depend from Claims 1 and 20 are also allowable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objections to Claims 11-13 and 30-32 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for immediate allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and full allowance of all pending claims.

No fee is believed due with this Response. If, however, Applicants have overlooked the need for any fee due with this Response, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayment associated with this Response to Deposit Account No. 08-2025 of Hewlett-Packard Company.

Respectfully submitted,

By: Hope Shimabuku
Hope Shimabuku
Reg. No. 57,072

Date: September 4, 2007

Hewlett-Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P. O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400
Tel. 970-898-7917